

APPLICATION TRANSFER REQUEST FOR S.N. 09/832729Section I. TRANSFER REQUEST BY (PRINT NAME) WITZDate 6/27/02TO: Art Unit 3762 3763Class/sub 604/135FROM: A.U. 1651Class 424

## REASON:

Apparatus claims only - not subject matter  
of art unit <sup>1651</sup> - a syringe

Gatekeeper concurrence \_\_\_\_\_

Hand carried: Personally accepted by \_\_\_\_\_

## Section II a. DISPOSITION BY RECEIVING TC By: \_\_\_\_\_

A.U. \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

☐ ACCEPTED BY RECEIVING T.C.

NOT ACCEPTED

☒ Forward to receiving TC Post Classifier☐ Non-classification issue/other, return to Originating TC/AU \_\_\_\_\_

## REASON:

Not a 604 device !!

N. S. S. S.  
Ar 3763 / 604  
8/24/02

## Section II b. DISPOSITION BY RECEIVING TC POST CLASSIFIER

☒ This dispute was resolved. Forward to TC/AU 3763 Class/Sub 604/82 Post Classifier T. Sweet Date 8/28/02

Concurring \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

☐ This dispute was not resolved, forward to DISPUTE RESOLUTION PANEL

Post Classifier Assessment:

I don't understand the objection to the claimed invention. If the claimed device was of general utility as a dispenser, I would say that 222/129+ would be more appropriate. Based on 31e disclosure and the body of art in the IDS supporting classification of these claims is 604/82. This is the best classification at this case.

Gatekeeper Concurrence \_\_\_\_\_

Post Classifier \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Section III. DISPOSITION BY DISPUTE RESOLUTION PANEL

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Panel Decision: Forward to Technology Center / Art Unit \_\_\_\_\_

Class/sub \_\_\_\_\_

## REASON:

Panel Member \_\_\_\_\_

Concurring Panel Member \_\_\_\_\_

☐ This application MAY NOT be returned to the dispute resolution panel. THIS IS A FINAL DISPOSITION.